

c.) Remarks

Claims 1-3, 8 and 9 have been amended to recite the present invention with the specificity required by statute, as well as for better grammatical and idiomatic usage only. The subject matter of the amendment may be found in the specification as filed, *inter alia*, at page 14, lines 13-15. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for the formal reasons noted at pages 2-3 of the Office Action. In response, transmitted herewith are two replacement sheets of formal drawings to be substituted for the corresponding drawing sheets presently on file in the above-identified application. The substitute drawing sheets have been prepared, and the specification has been amended, in conformity with the Examiner's suggestions. The Examiner's efforts in very thoroughly reviewing Applicants' specification are gratefully acknowledged.

Claim 1 is objected to for the formal reasons noted at page 3 of the Office Action. In response, claim 1 is amended as kindly suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 2 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner's statements in support of this rejection are set forth at pages 4-6 of the Office Action. In response, Applicants have above amended claims 2, 7, 8 and 9 in conformity with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, this rejection is mooted.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, these claims are also amended in

conformity with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, this rejection is mooted as well.¹

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hingsen-Gehrmann (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0142121) in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0036359) and Shimizu (JP 10-055147). Also, claims 2, 3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hingsen-Gehrmann in view of Yamamoto and Shimizu, in further view of Mimura (WO 02/103629).

Although this rejection is respectfully traversed, claim 1 has above been amended to recite that the auxiliary substrate is larger than the display device and is adapted to wrap around the display device. Applicants have discovered that this arrangement makes it more difficult to remove the display device once it is installed on the auxiliary substrate. Neither these features nor these advantages are either taught or suggested by the prior art, whether taken singly or in combination.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-5 and 8-10 of commonly assigned Application No 10/569,869 and provisionally under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over co-pending Application No 10/569,869 in view of Shimizu and Mimura. In response, in conformity with MPEP §706.02(l)(2) the undersigned wishes to report to the Examiner these inventions were commonly owned when they were made. Accordingly, the '869 application is unavailable as prior art herein. 35 U.S.C. §103(c)(1).

¹ As to the term "micro", such is above deleted to reduce the issues although, to complete the record, Applicants wish to explain that such is not intended to be a relative term but, to the contrary, is utilized instead as a term of art. See, for instance, U.S. patents 6,096,159, 6,942,350, 7,224,279, 7,248,169, 7,314,284, and 7,532,124.

Lastly, claims 1-3 and 7-9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 8-10 of co-pending Application No 10/569,869. In response, to reduce the issues and expedite prosecution, enclosed is a suitable Terminal Disclaimer. A depository account payment in the amount of \$140.00 to cover the fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.20(d) is being filed currently herewith. Any deficiencies may be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the Examiner's concerns are now overcome and the claims are now in allowable condition. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 remain presented for continued prosecution.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence S. Perry/
Lawrence S. Perry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,865

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LSP\ac

FCHS_WS 3514212_1.DOC